

Amendment dated April 19, 2011Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2011**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 15-21 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner's comments have been addressed in amending independent claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection is obviated, and thus, should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue et al. (hereinafter "Inoue"), U.S. Patent No. 7,249,937. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a supporting device including a plurality of coil springs that connects the compressor main body to the casing, wherein each of the plurality of coil springs includes a tightly wound upper end part fixed to one surface of the compressor main body, a tightly wound lower end part fixed to one surface of the casing, and an inner part formed between the tightly wound upper end part and the tightly wound lower end part, wherein the inner part comprises a first elastic part attached to the tightly wound upper end part with each round of the first elastic part wound at a first pitch; a second elastic part attached to the tightly wound lower end part with each round of the second elastic part wound at a second pitch; and a mass part tightly wound between the first elastic part and the second elastic part with zero pitch in a stop state, wherein the first pitch and the second pitch are different on

Amendment dated April 19, 2011

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2011

corresponding rounds starting from each end of the mass part. Inoue does not disclose or suggest such claimed features of independent claim 1, or the claimed combination.

That is, Inoue discloses a hermatic electric compressor including a coil spring 101, corresponded by the Examiner to the claimed supporting device. Inoue disclosed that the pitch of the coil spring 101 is uneven, referring to Fig. 2. That is, the coil spring 101 “has a wider pitch ‘a’ at [] both end portions, and gradually gets narrower to become a narrow pitch ‘b’ at the central portion...” See col. 4, lines 37-39 of Inoue. However, Inoue does not disclose or suggest at least the features of a first elastic part attached to the tightly wound upper end part with each round of the first elastic part wound at a first pitch and a second elastic part attached to the tightly wound lower end part with each round of the second elastic part wound at a second pitch, as well as a mass part tightly wound between the first elastic part and the second elastic part with zero pitch in a stop state, wherein the first pitch and the second pitch are different on corresponding rounds starting from each end of the mass part. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines over Inoue.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue, and further in view of Watanabe, U.S. Patent No. 6,193,225, Takamura et al. (hereinafter “Takamura”), U.S. Patent No. 5,246,215, or Kato, U.S. Patent No. 6,273,396. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a supporting device including a plurality of coil springs that connects the compressor main body to the casing, wherein each of the plurality of

Amendment dated April 19, 2011

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2011

coil springs includes a tightly wound upper end part fixed to one surface of the compressor main body, a tightly wound lower end part fixed to one surface of the casing, and an inner part formed between the tightly wound upper end part and the tightly wound lower end part, wherein the inner part comprises a first elastic part attached to the tightly wound upper end part with each round of the first elastic part wound at a first pitch; a second elastic part attached to the tightly wound lower end part with each round of the second elastic part wound at a second pitch; and a mass part tightly wound between the first elastic part and the second elastic part with zero pitch in a stop state, wherein the first pitch and the second pitch are different on corresponding rounds starting from each end of the mass part. Inoue, Watanabe, Takamura, or Kato, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest such claimed features of independent claim 1, or the claimed combination.

As indicated above, Inoue does not disclose or suggest at least the features of a first elastic part attached to the tightly wound upper end part with each round of the first elastic part wound at a first pitch and a second elastic part attached to the tightly wound lower end part with each round of the second elastic part wound at a second pitch, as well as a mass part tightly wound between the first elastic part and the second elastic part with zero pitch in a stop state, wherein the first pitch and the second pitch are different on corresponding rounds starting from each end of the mass part. Watanabe, Takamura, and Kato fail to overcome the deficiencies of Inoue. That is, Watanabe, Takamura, and Kato also fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of a first elastic part attached to the tightly wound upper end part with each round of

Amendment dated April 19, 2011

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2011

the first elastic part wound at a first pitch and a second elastic part attached to the tightly wound lower end part with each round of the second elastic part wound at a second pitch, as well as a mass part tightly wound between the first elastic part and the second elastic part with zero pitch in a stop state, wherein the first pitch and the second pitch are different on corresponding rounds starting from each end of the mass part.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines over Inoue, Watanabe, Takamura, or Kato. Dependent claims 15-21 are allowable over Inoue, Watanabe, Takamura, or Kato at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/572,954**

Docket No. **P-0769**

Amendment dated April 19, 2011

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2011

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzick
Registration No. 40,287

Correspondence Address:

P.O. Box 8638

Reston, VA 20195

(703) 766-3777 CLD:pb

Date: April 19, 2011

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-936\276287.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610